

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated December 9, 2008 (“the Office Action”). Claims 1-18, 21-24, and 26-34 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, and 28 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

I. Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Office Action asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the requesting device”. Applicants respectfully note that claim 1 recites “a requesting device,” which provides a basis for “the requesting device”. Applicants request that the § 112 rejection be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-18, 21, 23, 24, 26-29, 31, and 34 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6-18, 21, 23, 24, 26-29, 31, and 34, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,438,702 B1 (“Hodge”) in view of Cisco SOHO 90 Series Secure Broadband Routers, 1992-2002, Cisco Systems (“Cisco SOHO 90”) in further view of “Using NTP to Control and Synchronize System Clocks”, David Deeths, Sun BluePrints Online (July 2001) (“Deeths”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Hodge describe a process for providing a precise network time service that includes sending and receiving operation, administration, and maintenance (OAM) cells between a server and customer premise equipment. *See* Hodges, Abstract. The cited portions of Hodge do not disclose or suggest that customer premise equipment operates as an alarm system, an alarm clock, or an oven. The cited portions of Hodge do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Hodge do

not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1.

In further contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 90 do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 90 do not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1.

In further contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Deeths describe how to use Network Time Protocol (NTP) to synchronize system clocks. *See Deeths, Abstract*. The cited portions of Deeths do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Deeths do not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2, 4, and 6-13 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, and 6-13 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

The cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 14. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 14.

In contrast to claim 14, the cited portions of Hodge describe a process for providing a precise network time service that includes sending and receiving operation, administration, and maintenance (OAM) cells between a server and customer premise equipment. *See Hodges, Abstract*. The cited portions of Hodge do not disclose or suggest that customer premise equipment operates as an alarm system, an alarm clock, or an oven. The cited portions of Hodge do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Hodge do not disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 14.

In further contrast to claim 14, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 90 do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 90 do not

disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 14.

In further contrast to claim 14, the cited portions of Deeths describe how to use Network Time Protocol (NTP) to synchronize system clocks. *See Deeths, Abstract*. The cited portions of Deeths do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Deeths do not disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 14.

Therefore, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 14. Hence, claim 14 is allowable. Claims 15-18, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27 depend from claim 14. Accordingly, claims 15-18, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 14.

The cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 28. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28.

In contrast to claim 28, the cited portions of Hodge describe a process for providing a precise network time service that includes sending and receiving operation, administration, and maintenance (OAM) cells between a server and customer premise equipment. *See Hodges, Abstract*. The cited portions of Hodge do not disclose or suggest that customer premise equipment operates as an alarm system, an alarm clock, or an oven. The cited portions of Hodge do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Hodge do not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28.

In further contrast to claim 28, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 90 do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 90 do not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28.

In further contrast to claim 28, the cited portions of Deeths describe how to use Network Time Protocol (NTP) to synchronize system clocks. *See Deeths, Abstract*. The cited portions of Deeths do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of

Deeths do not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28.

Therefore, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 28. Hence, claim 28 is allowable. Claims 29, 31, and 34 depend from claim 28. Accordingly, claims 29, 31, and 34 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 28.

Claim 3 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 3, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Hodge in view of Cisco SOHO 90, in further view of Deeths and Cisco SOHO 71 Broadband Router Data Sheet ("Cisco SOHO 71"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. The cited portions of Cisco SOHO 71 do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths. For example, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 71 fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 71 describe an Ethernet to Ethernet router that connects to a DSL or cable modem and allows multiple users to share a broadband connection. *See* Cisco SOHO 71, first paragraph. The cited portions of Cisco SOHO 71 do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Cisco SOHO 71 do not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1, from which claim 3 depends. Hence, claim 3 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 1.

Claims 5, 22, and 30 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 5, 22, and 30, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Hodge in view of Cisco SOHO 90, Deeths, and further in view of "Release Notes For Cisco Aironet 1200 Series Access Points Running Firmware Version 12.00T", 2002, Cisco Systems ("Aironet"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. The cited portions of Aironet do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths. For example, the cited portions of Aironet fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Aironet disclose that the Cisco Aironet 1200 Series supports prioritized Quality of Service for downlink traffic on IEEE 802.11 links. *See Aironet*, page 4. The cited portions of Aironet do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Aironet do not disclose or suggest a plurality of device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. Hence, claim 5 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 1.

Claim 22 depends from claim 14. As explained above, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 14. The cited portions of Aironet do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 14 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths. For example, the cited portions of Aironet fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 14. In contrast to claim 14, the cited portions of Aironet disclose that the Cisco Aironet 1200 Series supports prioritized Quality of Service for downlink traffic on IEEE 802.11 links. *See Aironet*, page 4. The cited portions of Aironet do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Aironet do not disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 14, from which claim 22 depends. Hence, claim 22 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 14.

Claim 30 depends from claim 28. As explained above, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 28. The cited portions of Aironet do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 28 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths. For example, the cited portions of Aironet fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28. In contrast

to claim 28, the cited portions of Aironet disclose that the Cisco Aironet 1200 Series supports prioritized Quality of Service for downlink traffic on IEEE 802.11 links. *See* Aironet, page 4. The cited portions of Aironet do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of Aironet do not disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28, from which claim 30 depends. Hence, claim 30 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 28.

Claims 32 and 33 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 32 and 33, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Hodge in view of Cisco SOHO 90 in further view of Deeths and U.S. Patent No. 6,393,126 B1 (“van der Kaay”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 28. As explained above, the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 28. The cited portions of van der Kaay do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 28 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Hodge, Cisco SOHO 90, and Deeths. For example, the cited portions of van der Kaay fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28. In contrast to claim 28, the cited portions of van der Kaay disclose certifying a trusted local clock with a trusted master clock and signing time stamps using public key cryptography to enable subsequent authentication. *See* van der Kaay, Abstract. The cited portions of van der Kaay do not mention alarm systems, alarm clocks, or ovens. Therefore, the cited portions of van der Kaay do not disclose or suggest a plurality of home network device nodes that include at least one of an alarm system, an alarm clock, and an oven, as in claim 28, from which claims 32 and 33 depend. Hence, claims 32 and 33 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 28.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the cited references as applied in the Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

3-9-2009
Date



Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant
TOLER LAW GROUP, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)